



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,276	10/14/2003	Peter I. Majewicz	100204307-1	4923
22879 7590 07/11/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
EXAMINER BAKER, CHARLOTTE M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/11/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/685,276

Applicant(s)

MAJEWICZ, PETER I.

Examiner

CHARLOTTE M. BAKER

Art Unit

2625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16, 31 and 32 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 17-30 and 33-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S608)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 17-34 contain non-statutory subject matter because Applicant's definition of a computer-readable medium includes communication types and transmission types (see Applicant's Specification, pp. 12-13, par. 51).
4. Under communication or transmission types of medium definition, treating each claim as a whole, it is claiming a signal. A signal does not fall within any of the statutory categories; therefore, claims 17-34 are non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12-14, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 28-30, 33-39 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Moore (US 2004/0135790 A1).

Regarding claim 1: The structural elements of apparatus claim 17 perform all of the steps of method claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 17.

Regarding claim 3: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 1. The structural elements of apparatus claim 19 perform all of the steps of method claim 3. Thus, claim 3 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 19.

Regarding claim 5: The structural elements of apparatus claim 21 perform all of the steps of method claim 5. Thus, claim 5 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 21.

Regarding claim 7: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 5. The structural elements of apparatus claim 23 perform all of the steps of method claim 7. Thus, claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 23.

Regarding claim 9: The structural elements of apparatus claim 25 perform all of the steps of method claim 9. Thus, claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 25.

Regarding claim 12: The structural elements of apparatus claim 28 perform all of the steps of method claim 12. Thus, claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 28.

Regarding claim 13: The structural elements of apparatus claim 29 perform all of the steps of method claim 13. Thus, claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 29.

Regarding claim 14: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 13. The structural elements of apparatus claim 30 perform all of the steps of method claim 14. Thus, claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 30.

Regarding claim 17: Moore discloses rendering a color image (Fig. 8, displaying 814 the image; displaying 814 the image can include displaying on a computer display, such as a CRT, LCD or other video device, par. 39); in response to a user selecting an adjustment to a first color in the image (this selection or association indicates to the image-processing software 210 a color or chrominance the operator expects or prefers for the selected region 218, par. 28), making a perceptually uniform adjustment to the first color in the image (a color or chrominance the operator expects or prefers, par. 28; in terms of an $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 29; image-processing software 210 calculates or determines a chrominance difference, error, or comparison vector 418, par. 32; pixels of the image 110 are shifted by an amount and in a direction defined by the chrominance comparison vector 418, par. 34); and rendering (corrected image can be rendered, par. 35) an adjusted color image reflecting the adjustment made to the first color in the image (corrected colors 518 result in a corrected image 610, par. 35).

Regarding claim 19: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 17. Moore further discloses instructions for printing the color image and printing the adjusted color image (corrected image 610 can be rendered by a rendering device, par. 35).

Regarding claim 21: Moore discloses rendering a color image (Fig. 8, displaying 814 the image; displaying 814 the image can include displaying on a computer display, such as a CRT, LCD or other video device, par. 39); displaying a palette of memory colors appearing in the image (displaying a palette 822 of standard memory colors, par. 40); displaying a menu of memory color adjustments (select a standard color from a displayed palette in a pull down menu, dialog box or other choice presentation scheme, par. 41) (memory color selector 924, par. 49); in response to a user selecting an adjustment to a first memory color in the image (the color cast calculator 926 calculator receives memory color selection from the memory color selector 924, par. 50), making a perceptually uniform adjustment to the first memory color in the image (a color or chrominance the operator expects or prefers, par. 28; in terms of an $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 29; image-processing software 210 calculates or determines a chrominance difference, error, or comparison vector 418, par. 32; pixels of the image 110 are shifted by an amount and in a direction defined by the chrominance comparison vector 418, par. 34) (color information is transformed into $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 50); and rendering an adjusted color image reflecting the adjustment made to the first memory color in the image (a system operator can review the output image on the display and verify that the color cast has been properly adjusted, par. 54).

Regarding claim 23: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 21. Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 19 are applicable.

Regarding claim 25: Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 21 are applicable.

Regarding claim 28: Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 21 are applicable. In addition, Moore discloses printing a color image (a printed version of the image can be considered a display of the image, par. 39); printing an adjusted color image reflecting the adjustment made to the selected memory color (system operator can review the output image...rendering device can be a print engine, par. 54).

Regarding claim 29: Moore discloses printing a color image (a printed version of the image can be considered a display of the image, par. 39); prompting a user to select a memory color appearing in the image (displaying a palette 822 of standard memory colors, par. 40); prompting the user to select an adjustment to the selected memory color (select a standard color from a displayed palette in a pull down menu, dialog box or other choice presentation scheme, par. 41) (memory color selector 924, par. 49); in response to the user selecting a memory color, identifying the selected memory color in a perceptually uniform color modeling space (color information is transformed into $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 50); in response to the user selecting an adjustment to the selected memory color, adjusting the identified memory color in the perceptually uniform color modeling space (color information is transformed into $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 50); transforming the adjusted memory color in the perceptually uniform color modeling space (color information is transformed into $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 50) to a color in a printer color modeling space (color cast corrector 930 transforms the input image information into an image description based on the convenient color space, par. 53)(color cast corrector 930 produces an output image 950, par. 54); and printing an adjusted color image reflecting the adjustment made to the selected memory color (system operator can review the output image...rendering device can be a print engine, par. 54).

Regarding claim 30: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 29. Moore further discloses prompting the user to select the color image (Fig. 8, selecting a portion of the image 818 related with a memory color, par. 38) and printing the selected color image (displaying 814 the image can include a printed version of the image, par. 39).

Regarding claim 33: Moore discloses a color image (Fig. 2, image 110); a palette of memory colors appearing in the image (Fig. 3, memory color palette 310); controls for adjusting a color on the palette (color palette selection tool 318, par. 28); and programming for making perceptually uniform adjustments to the color image corresponding to the adjustment controls (a color or chrominance the operator expects or prefers, par. 28; in terms of an $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 29; image-processing software 210 calculates or determines a chrominance difference, error, or comparison vector 418, par. 32; pixels of the image 110 are shifted by an amount and in a direction defined by the chrominance comparison vector 418, par. 34).

Regarding claim 34: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 33. Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 17 are applicable.

Regarding claim 35: Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 33 are applicable. In addition, Moore discloses a print engine (xerographic print engine, par. 54); a user interface (memory color selector 924, par. 49); and a controller operatively coupled to the print engine and the user interface (xerographic print engines are known to include a user, a developer and an imaging member, par. 54), the controller having a processor and a memory (Fig. 9, image processing system 910) storing a color image (image processing system 910 contains image storage 934, par. 45 and par. 54).

Regarding claim 36: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 35. Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 28 are applicable.

Regarding claim 37: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 36. Moore further discloses displaying the palette of memory colors on the user interface (Fig. 3, memory color palette 310) and displaying controls for adjusting a color on the user interface (color palette selection tool 318, par. 28).

Regarding claim 38: Moore discloses a computer (Fig. 9, image processing system 910) having a processor (image processing) and a memory (Fig. 9, image storage 934) storing a color image (output image can be stored by image storage 934, par. 54), a palette of memory colors appearing in the image (Fig. 3, memory color palette 310) and controls for adjusting a color on the palette (color palette selection tool 318, par. 28); and a printer (Fig. 9, rendering device 938) operatively coupled to the computer (Fig. 9, image processing system 910), the printer comprising a print engine (xerographic print engine, par. 54) and a controller (Fig. 9, color cast corrector 930) operatively coupled to the print engine (xerographic print engine, par. 54), the controller (Fig. 9, color cast corrector 930) having a processor and a memory storing programming for making perceptually uniform adjustments (a color or chrominance the operator expects or prefers, par. 28; in terms of an $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 29; image-processing software 210 calculates or determines a chrominance difference, error, or comparison vector 418, par. 32; pixels of the image 110 are shifted by an amount and in a direction defined by the chrominance comparison vector 418, par. 34) (color information is transformed into $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 50) to the color image corresponding to the adjustment controls on the computer (verify proper adjustment has occurred, par. 54).

Regarding claim 39: Moore discloses a means for rendering a color image (Fig. 8, displaying 814 the image; displaying 814 the image can include displaying on a computer display, such as a CRT, LCD or other video device, par. 39); a means for (Fig. 9, color cast calculator 926 and par. 50, the color cast calculator 926 receives image portion selection information from the image portion selector 918 and from the memory color selector 924, par. 50), in response to a user selecting an adjustment to a color in the image (this selection or association indicates to the image-processing software 210 a color or chrominance the operator expects or prefers for the selected region 218, par. 28), making a perceptually uniform adjustment to the color in the image (a color or chrominance the operator expects or prefers, par. 28; in terms of an $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 29; image-processing software 210 calculates or determines a chrominance difference, error, or comparison vector 418, par. 32; pixels of the image 110 are shifted by an amount and in a direction defined by the chrominance comparison vector 418, par. 34); and a means for rendering an adjusted color image (Fig. 9, color cast corrector 930 and par. 54, a system operator can review the output image on the display and verify that the color cast has been properly adjusted) reflecting the adjustment made to the color in the image (par. 54, a system operator can review the output image on the display and verify that the color cast has been properly adjusted).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore in view of Gruzdev et al. (US 2003/0002095 A1).

Regarding claim 2: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 1. The structural elements of apparatus claim 18 perform all of the steps of method claim 2. Thus, claim 2 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 18.

Regarding claim 4: Moore in view of Gruzdev et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 2. The structural elements of apparatus claim 20 perform all of the steps of method claim 4. Thus, claim 4 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 20.

Regarding claim 6: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 5. The structural elements of apparatus claim 22 perform all of the steps of method claim 6. Thus, claim 6 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 22.

Regarding claim 8: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 6. The structural elements of apparatus claim 24 perform all of the steps of method claim 8. Thus, claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 24.

Regarding claim 10: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 9. The structural elements of apparatus claim 26 perform all of the steps of method claim 10. Thus, claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 26.

Regarding claim 11: Moore in view of Gruzdev et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 10. The structural elements of apparatus claim 27 perform all of the steps of method claim 11. Thus, claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons discussed in the rejection of claim 27.

Regarding claim 18: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 17. Moore further discloses making a perceptually uniform adjustment (a color or chrominance the operator expects or

prefers, par. 28; in terms of an $L^*a^*b^*$ color space, par. 29; image-processing software 210 calculates or determines a chrominance difference, error, or comparison vector 418, par. 32; pixels of the image 110 are shifted by an amount and in a direction defined by the chrominance comparison vector 418, par. 34); rendering (corrected image can be rendered, par. 35).

Moore fails to specifically address in response to a user selecting an adjustment to a second color in the adjusted image; to the second color in the adjusted image; a second adjusted color image reflecting the adjustment made to the second color in the adjusted image.

Gruzdev et al. disclose in response to a user selecting an adjustment to a second color in the adjusted image (second color may be chosen by an operator selecting a color from within the first image, par. 39); to the second color in the adjusted image (second color may be selected from a stored collection of colors; and related to human perception, par. 39); a second adjusted color image (second color may be chosen by an operator selecting a color from within the first image, par. 39) reflecting the adjustment made to the second color in the adjusted image (second color may be chosen by an operator selecting a color from within the first image, par. 39) (second color may be selected from a stored collection of colors; and related to human perception, par. 39).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include selection of a second color in order to allow the operator to modify a specific color or range of colors in an image as taught by Gruzdev et al. (par. 18).

Regarding claim 20: Moore in view of Gruzdev et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 18.

Moore fail to specifically address wherein the second color is the same as the first color.

Gruzdev et al. disclose wherein the second color is the same as the first color .(selecting a first color to be corrected, selecting a second color to replace the first color, par. 39).

Regarding claim 22: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 21. Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 18 are applicable.

Regarding claim 24: Moore in view of Gruzdev et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 22. Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 20 are applicable.

Regarding claim 26: Moore satisfies all the elements of claim 25. Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 22 are applicable.

Regarding claim 27: Moore in view of Gruzdev et al. satisfy all the elements of claim 26. Arguments analogous to those stated in the rejection of claim 24 are applicable.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 15-16 and 31-32 (claims 31-32 are allowable provided the 101 rejection is overcome) are allowed.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Schroder (US 2002/0136452 A1).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHARLOTTE M. BAKER whose telephone number is (571)272-7459. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. M. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Edward L. Coles/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625